1	INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE			
2	BOARD OF APPEALS			
3			II.	
4		1	Village Hall 196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York	
5		N	March 19, 2014	
6			7:40 p.m.	
7				
8	APPLICATION:	Weissman 22 Larch Hill Road Lawrence, New York		
9				
10	PRESENT:			
11		MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman		
12				
13	MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB Member			
14		MR. MARK SCHRECK Member		
15		MR. LESTER HENNER		
16		Member		
17		MS. ESTHER WILLIAM Member	IAMS	
18			T.00	
19		MR. KENNETH GRAY, Village Attorney	ESQ.	
20		MR. MICHAEL RYDER Building Departmen	o.t	
21		bulluling Departmen		
22				
23				
24		N# -		
25		-	Benci, RPR t Reporter	

Weissman - 3/19/14

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay, good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the Lawrence Board of Zoning Appeals. Please turn off your cell phones. And if there's any conversations, please take them outside. Thank you so much.

We welcome Mr. Gray who is sitting in for Mr. Pantelis this evening.

MR. GRAY: Good evening.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Thank you very much for joining us. I hope you will feel the same at the end of the evening.

Anyway, Mr. Ryder, proof of posting.

MR. RYDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I offer proof of posting.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Thank you so much.

Okay, the first matters are requests for extensions on variances. We have Avram Weissman, 22 Larch Hill Road, who sent in a letter requesting an extension on his variance which is about to expire. He is requesting a one-year extension. The work was not completed due to some overruns on his budget. And he expects to complete it in a year's time.

Any objection from anyone?
(No response.)

Weissman - 3/19/14

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So one year is okay. Νo problem.

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 7:41 p.m.)

Certified that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the original stenographic minutes in this case.

MARY BENCI, RPR

Court Reporter

1	INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE		
2	BOARD OF APPEALS		
3		77 ¹	
4		Village Hall 196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York	
5		March 19, 2014	
6		7:41 p.m.	
7 8	APPLICATION:	Popack 350 Longwood Crossing	
9		Lawrence, New York	
10	PRESENT:		
11		MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman	
12	MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB Member		
13			
14		MR. MARK SCHRECK Member	
15		MR. LESTER HENNER	
16		Member	
17		MS. ESTHER WILLIAMS Member	
18		MR. KENNETH GRAY, ESQ.	
19		Village Attorney	
20		MR. MICHAEL RYDER Building Department	
21		Darraring Department	
22			
23			
24		Many Donat DDD	
25		Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter	

Popack - 3/19/14

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The next one is a request from Popack, 250 Longwood Crossing. We have a letter from his attorney, Mr. Guardino, explaining that no work was done due to Sandy and other matters. In the letter he makes reference to the fact that there are some changes pending on new plans that had been submitted.

I think it's important we go on the record that, in general, variances have to be adhered to as approved. If there are going to be any changes, then he will have to submit by review for the Board. So it's important that we communicate with attorney Guardino that if there are changes that he's going to have to come back to the Board for approval.

As far as the requests for extension of two years, I think at this point since there is time remaining on the variance to the end of May, I would like to hear more from Mr. Guardino.

Perhaps at our next session, which is at the end of April, there will be more adequate time to get some details and we can take it under advisement at that point in time. Okay.

MR. RYDER: That's good.

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at

Certified that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the original stenographic minutes in this case.

MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter

1	INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE		
2	BOARD OF APPEALS		
3			
4		Village Hall 196 Central Avenue	
5		Lawrence, New York	
6		March 19, 2014 7:43 p.m.	
7			
8	APPLICATION:	455 Mistletoe Way	
9		Lawrence, New York	
10	PRESENT:		
11		MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman	
12			
13		MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB Member	
14		MR. MARK SCHRECK Member	
15		MR. LESTER HENNER	
16		Member	
17		MS. ESTHER WILLIAMS Member	
18			
19		MR. KENNETH GRAY, ESQ. Village Attorney	
20		MR. MICHAEL RYDER Building Department	
21		bulluling beparement	
22			
23			
24		Mary Danci DDD	
25		Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter	

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The first matter this evening we'll address is that of Albert of Mistletoe Way. If Mr. Albert or anyone on his behalf is present.

MR. ELBAUM: Hi, good evening. My name is
Eli Elbaum from the firm Forchelli, Curto, Deegan,
located at 330 Earle Ovington Boulevard,
Uniondale, New York.

Good evening, Chairman, members of the Board, Counselor. This is an application for surface coverage for the premises 455 Mistletoe Way, Section 41, Block 15, Lot 1, located in the Residence AA Zoning District.

You may recall, that this residence was before this Board in 2011 seeking a few variances for the construction of a single-family residence and a pool, among other items. Those variances were granted. There was a height variance, a lot coverage variance, as well as a building coverage variance. During those -- over the course of those hearings --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: If I may ask, what was the term of the variance, how long?

MR. ELBAUM: I believe it was two years. I don't --

1 2

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Do you know if any extension was requested? Mr. Meister is here.

MR. MEISTER: I'm not sure. We're in the

middle of construction.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Let Mary know your name and address.

MR. MEISTER: Warren Meister, the architect for the premises, 22 Kendall Drive, New City, New York.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Ryder, from the Building Department, do we know if there was an extension on the variance?

MR. RYDER: I don't know that right now, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gray, if there was not an extension of the variance, what's the status of the work?

MR. GRAY: Well, it's -- I mean, substantial compliance construction would have had to start within six months from my understanding of that variance, and it would have had to be complete two years from the date of the issuance, which I believe was April 2011.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Right.

MR. ELBAUM: Substantial construction

certainly has commenced, although the construction isn't completed. I don't know and certainly can know, not at the present moment unfortunately, whether extension was applied for and/or granted by the Board.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Well, if the variance has expired, what's the status of the construction?

MR. GRAY: Well, in theory, the variance would expire and a CO would not be able to be issued for the project.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: From a practical position of this evening, are we able to hear an extension or a modification after a variance that has expired?

MR. GRAY: It's a valid question.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I'm sorry. I didn't mean to put you on the spot.

MR. GRAY: No, no, that's quite all right. I don't believe you even have an application for an extension in front of you.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: It's not an extension. I meant a modification I guess is what I meant.

MR. GRAY: Well, I mean, the question is can you modify something that's already expired is the problem.

2.2

MEMBER WILLIAMS: That's what he's asking.

MR. GRAY: Well, that is the problem. And if it's a request for an extension, it probably wasn't posted as a request for an extension on any notices or agenda. Is that correct, Mr. Ryder?

MR. RYDER: Correct.

MR. GRAY: I don't have the posting here so it could be problematic. I'm trying to put it delicately.

MR. ELBAUM: Since I unfortunately don't have the answer to this question, I would just ask, customarily, has this Board reheard -- in the event that applications -- variances that were granted have expired, would the Board hold any new hearing as if they were coming anew? Or is there a concept of a request for an extension, I guess, after the variance has expired without an actual public hearing as if the Board hasn't heard the merits of the case before? Because if the answer is the latter, I --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The answer is that we haven't been faced with this problem before, at least in my experience.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Not that I recall.

MR. ELBAUM: There are two other cases here.

1 2

2.3

Perhaps if I suggest we could move to another case while I can possibly check with my office as to see if I can produce something evidencing that it was extended.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Good idea, very good idea. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken; the application was recalled.)

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We'd like to call back the Albert group.

MR. ELBAUM: Hello.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So what has your research uncovered?

MR. ELBAUM: We don't believe an extension has been filed from either of our offices or the applicant, so we don't believe an extension has been filed period.

With that in mind, first, I'd just want to -where we are -- or where, excuse me. Where the
applicant is, is essentially almost done with
completion of the building, almost ready to move
in and furniture.

MR. MEISTER: Furniture is ordered, painters about to start. We're nearly there.

MR. ELBAUM: Now, with that in mind and

reviewing the code in the time-out as thoroughly as one could out there, and reviewing the actual approval from 2011, I don't believe the 24-month limitation, if you will, is codified. I think it is a condition of the Board. I didn't find it in the statute -- in the zoning statute.

With that in mind, I believe it would be possible for the Board to waive or amend a condition. In other words, it's not a legislative act by the Board of Trustees that only the Board of Trustees can waive or amend. It's a condition of a variance imposed by the Board of Zoning Appeals that the Board of Zoning Appeals can certainly waive or amend, and we would formally request right here that the Board do that and allow us to continue.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Care to respond, Mr. Henner?

MEMBER HENNER: Look, I appreciate that you are asking for a waiver. On the other hand, I think it sets a bad precedent for an applicant to be -- I don't want to say in default, because that's a bad term, but to have missed a deadline on a variance. Variances have conditions, like you just heard eighteen months on the last one,

1

and this was given two years and it was missed by almost a year. So I would think rather than ask the Board to waive it, the proposal that should come forward is, you know what, we missed it, we'll apply for it, and you'll have it before -you'll have it, you know, on Monday, and just put it on for the next month, okay, because I think -and then combine everything, because otherwise you're asking the Board to sit here and deal with an application that's lapsed, or a variance that's lapsed, and what kind of precedent would that be for every variance that's granted. You've been here all night. You saw how flexible we are. Every variance that was asked for tonight went through, up until now. But your time has lapsed, and I think the right way to go is more to say, you know what, it didn't happen, I don't know who did and who forgot, whatever, these things happen, and I understand that. We'll do it, we'll come The next meeting is in April. We'll bring all our papers. We'll then request a variance. This way you can post public notice of it. Don't ask the Board to waive its requirement. The ball is in your court; the ball is not in the Board's court. And it's a bad precedent, in my

opinion. I'm just one guy here, and I'm a friend of your application, I like your application, but procedurally, you know --

MR. ELBAUM: I absolutely understand.

MEMBER HENNER: You follow?

MR. ELBAUM: Can I just ask, when you say -the it you referred to is an extension request
or --

MEMBER HENNER: I think at the beginning of the meeting we granted two variance extensions.

Am I right, is that what we did? We granted extensions that were the same -- you know, the exact logistics will be explained to you. It's a one-page letter, and then we're on for next month. And I don't know any reason why -- I mean, I think technically you have a variance that's lapsed.

Somebody could sit and issue stop work orders and stuff like that. No one is doing that.

MR. ELBAUM: We certainly appreciate that.

MEMBER HENNER: Hey, that's not the world's biggest favor, but by the same token, you can't come and say how about the Board waive it and just look the other way. That's bad news in my opinion.

MR. ELBAUM: I appreciate that.

1 2

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We'll take into consideration that today is the 19th. It's on the 26th of April I believe the next meeting.

MR. RYDER: 28th.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The 28th of April. And two weeks of that is down time anyway for Passover, so we're talking about a minimal period of time.

MR. RYDER: April 30th, excuse me.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: April 30th. It's still minimal.

MEMBER HENNER: It's still April.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: The fact that it will be a year past its expiration, does that affect our ability to give an extension?

MR. GRAY: No. I don't know who you're asking, I'm sorry.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I didn't know who I was asking either. I was asking counsel, yes.

MR. ELBAUM: And just as a formality, if I may ask, a stand-alone extension would require a public hearing -- I'm sorry, a public notice for that extension?

MEMBER WILLIAMS: The same public notice that we have to give.

1 MR. ELBAUM: I'm just asking, okay. 2 MR. MEISTER: So does the public notice that 3 we had for tonight's appearance --4 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: It should stand good for 5 that as well. We don't require for extension a 6 public notice. 7 MR. GRAY: It would be a continuation of 8 tonight's hearing. 9 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Right, a continuation. 10 Okay, so that being said, any other comments? 11 MR. MEISTER: We would just --12 MR. ELBAUM: And the object would be to hear 13 the extension request as well as the extension of the --14 15 MR. GRAY: The merits. 16 MR. ELBAUM: -- the merits of the new 17 application -- or the continued application? 18 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: If you don't wish to extend it --19 20 MR. ELBAUM: The extension of the extension, 21 if you will. 22 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: You might get either one. 23 We just don't know which. 24 MR. ELBAUM: Either way, it will be an 25 extension.

Albert - 3/19/141 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We'll review the variances 2 and then, yes, the answer is yes. 3 MR. ELBAUM: All right, we appreciate it. 4 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So it's not adjourned. 5 It's continued to the next. 6 MR. GRAY: Correct. It's basically a motion 7 to continue this hearing at the April 30th 8 hearing, with the understanding that the 9 application is going to submit a -- the applicant 10 is going to submit an application for an extension 11 of time for the previously granted time frame in 12 his variance. 13 MR. MEISTER: Does this extension letter have 14

to come from the architect's office or could it come from the --

MR. ELBAUM: We'll figure that out.

MR. RYDER: Either or. We accept it from the architect. We accept it from the homeowner. more personal from the homeowner.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: But then it's not billable.

MR. RYDER: Mr. Meister, that can be addressed to my office.

MR. MEISTER: Terrific.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ELBAUM: Thank you. We appreciate it.

Have a good night.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: See you next month.

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 8:55 p.m.)

Certified that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the original stenographic minutes in this case.

MARY BENCI, RPR

Official Court Reporter

1	INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE		
2	BOARD OF APPEALS		
3			
4			Village Hall .96 Central Avenue
5			awrence, New York
6			March 19, 2014 7:48 p.m.
7			
8	APPLICATION:	Saffra 22 Bayberry Road Lawrence, New Yorl	v
9		nawiciice, new ioii	n.
10	PRESENT:		
11		MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman	
12		MR. EDWARD GOTTLIE	7 B
13		Member	2.0
14		MR. MARK SCHRECK Member	
15		MR. LESTER HENNER	
16		Member	
17		MS. ESTHER WILLIAM Member	1S
18		MR. KENNETH GRAY,	ESO
19		Village Attorney	~~ <u>~</u> .
20		MR. MICHAEL RYDER Building Departmer	n †
21		bulluling Departmen	I C
22			
23			
24		.,	Daniel DDD
25			Benci, RPR t Reporter

MR. SAFFRA: Good evening. My name is Norman 2 Saffra, 22 Bayberry Road, Lawrence, New York. 3 the homeowner. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: One second. 4 5 MR. SAFFRA: Sure.

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Off the record.

(Whereupon, a discussion was held off the record.)

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Back to Saffra. coming --

MR. SAFFRA: My architect this evening, Mr. Capobianco, unfortunately could not attend, as he had an emergent medical procedure done this afternoon. He apologizes.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I can attest to the fact that it's true. I was on the plane with him about a week ago, and he was in no shape to make a presentation.

MR. SAFFRA: So this evening I'm going to be representing myself, if it please the committee and the Chair.

Ten years ago I came before this Board requesting a variance for some work we were doing on the house. Since that time we've been blessed with further expansion of our family, and at this

2

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

time I come before the Board again now seeking an additional variance for proposed work.

Our proposed work is to --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: It would be very helpful if you start with what was proposed last time, what was granted last time, and then we'll go into --

Absolutely. I didn't know if MR. SAFFRA: the Board was hot or not.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We're very hot. However, there's a lot of documents here, so we want to make it very simple.

MR. SAFFRA: Not a problem.

Ten years ago, we applied and were granted the following: The ability to extend the house onto the side here which took us onto Bayberry Road, where an extension of two bedrooms was An extension was granted to push out the front of the house several feet so we could redo the grade of the steps as there were quite a number. An extension was added in the rear taking away an existing overhanging deck and putting in a den at that point in time. We also added an external deck up on the second story which is 19 feet by 14 feet that is currently in existence,

1	and if it please the Board, a rear photo
2	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We have that. As a hot
3	Board, we reviewed it.
4	MR. SAFFRA: We propose at this current point
5	in time removing said deck and extending the
6	kitchen then into the area occupied by the deck.
7	So it would
8	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Would it be the same
9	square footage?
L O	MR. SAFFRA: Same square footage. The deck
1	underneath the deck is currently concrete so
_2	that there are there is no water issue because
.3	that area is already covered by concrete, so it
. 4	should not add to any existing water drainage
. 5	issues. We plan on keeping exactly within that
.6	footprint of the existing deck. And that because
. 7	of that, we
. 8	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Is that a two-story
.9	structure you're putting in?
20	MR. SAFFRA: Two-story structure. We would
1	like to know
2	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Below is storage?
3	MR. SAFFRA: Storage, correct.
4	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And above?

MR. SAFFRA: Above, kitchen extension.

Because of the configuration, we are in need of three variances; one for setback ratio, the other for a rear-yard setback. Again, it's already in existence as is, but because this is --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Well, it would go to the same point as the den?

MR. SAFFRA: Correct, correct.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That's why you're requesting the 30 foot, more or less.

MR. SAFFRA: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: As opposed to the 40 that's required.

MR. SAFFRA: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: But in fact, you already have that pre-existing.

MR. SAFFRA: Correct, correct.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay.

MR. SAFFRA: And with the additional, as the deck does not count for building coverage, but it only counts for lot coverage, the request increase in building coverage is what we are here for this evening. When one adds the deck to the numbers, the 14 by 19 square feet, that's 266 square feet, we're adding for our existing 2,935 up to the proposed 3,253, if you count the deck within that

additional space we're requesting only 52 additional square feet because we're eliminating the deck. I have taken these plans and reviewed it.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So you're saying if we had looked at the deck as building coverage --

MR. SAFFRA: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: -- the differential would be 52 feet?

MR. SAFFRA: Correct. I have reviewed the plans.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: On the other hand, if we had looked at the deck originally as such, we may not have -- as building coverage, we may not have granted the variances.

MR. SAFFRA: Very well said, Chairman. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay.

MR. SAFFRA: I have reviewed the plans with all the neighbors. The neighbors all who abut my property, including the rear yard and side yard, have signed the petition supporting the extension, and I'd like to submit that as Exhibit 1 or A. It's the only one I have.

MR. GRAY: We'll make that part of the record.

1 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Mike, there was mention of 2 24 feet. Has that been resolved or still open? 3 MR. RYDER: If we can go back to 2003. know your property better than anybody. 4 5 MR. SAFFRA: Yes. 6 MR. RYDER: The site plan shows a setback to 7 the rear property line of 24 feet. 8 MR. SAFFRA: Actually, I have a survey post-construction that shows more than that. 9 So 10 the 24 was an error, clearly, because the 11 post-construction survey shows that we have 12 40 feet from the building, but only 30 feet from 13 the deck (handing). 14 MR. RYDER: Forty feet to the building was 15 always established. 16 MR. SAFFRA: Correct. 17 MR. RYDER: That we have, that's accurate, 18 but to the deck we show it at 24. And there's a 19 letter from the Village, there's a site plan. 20 What you're telling me is that now you'll have a 21 30-foot setback? 22 MR. SAFFRA: Correct.

23

24

25

MR. RYDER: Which is more?

MR. SAFFRA: Correct, per the -- in our measurements from the surveys and the plans,

correct. There may be and that the difference in the calculation may be that there is a slight overhang of the deck from the support structures, and that's going to be flush with the support structures, so that overhang may be that difference in the calculation.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Six feet.

MR. SAFFRA: There is a small cantilever and that's probably what represents from the cantilever as opposed to where the concrete is, and you can see that on the photograph.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: If the building will only go to the concrete.

MR. SAFFRA: Correct.

MR. RYDER: Does that satisfy?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We just want to be accurate.

MR. RYDER: Thank you, Mr. Saffra.

MR. SAFFRA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. In terms of the water spill-off, now we have a structure coming all the way down, we're enclosing it for storage, the lower part, so how are we addressing that?

And what's the story with Bayberry in general at that area; are there flooding issues? Are there

Saffra - 3/19/14 1 water issues? 2 MR. RYDER: Bayberry is in the flood zone. There is flooding in that area, I would say in 50 3 4 percent of the rainstorms. Correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Saffra, but 5 6 there are several dry wells on the property? 7 MR. SAFFRA: Correct. MR. RYDER: The deck which is open below had 8 a slab underneath which is similar to the coverage 9 10 that would be with the building. MEMBER GOTTLIEB: And that slab was not 11 12 considered building coverage, obviously. 13 MR. RYDER: No, it was surface coverage. 14 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: During Superstorm Sandy, 15 did you experience water in your house? 16 MR. SAFFRA: No, I did not. We were the high point of Bayberry with the refugees coming up to 17 18 our abode. 19 MEMBER WILLIAMS: You said before the 20 property between the posts to the house that's 2.1 concrete now? 22 MR. SAFFRA: That's concrete underneath, 23 correct.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: So you're basically covering concrete.

24

MR. SAFFRA: Correct. MEMBER WILLIAMS: You're not covering any grass area. MR. SAFFRA: Correct, correct. MEMBER WILLIAMS: I just wanted to clarify that. MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Either way, for 266 square feet do we need to put in dry wells, Mike, generally? MR. RYDER: Generally, yes, yes. That he has dry wells on the site and that there will be no increase but of 52 square feet, I believe what he has currently on the site is sufficient for drainage. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Dr. Saffra, do we have to be concerned about creepy annexation here? Are we going to see you in a few years? MR. SAFFRA: Well, since I'm already now fifty, and my wife is -- yes, and my wife is, I think we are at a point where while it's lovely to visit this Board, I'd rather be home doing homework with the kids. Let me rephrase that. Strike that from the record, please. That will

come back and bite me.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Any questions from any

Board members?

3 4 5

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I consider this to be approximately an 11 percent surface, rather not surface, building coverage, and that's the percentage that I'm going to use when I consider this application for my vote.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. Does anyone in the audience want to comment?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay, so as my colleague has said, it's an additional 11 percent over the existing going onto the existing concrete slab, and just enclosing area that's already there. So I think we're quite sympathetic and since you're 50 years old.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Additional sympathy goes out.

MR. SAFFRA: I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So taking into consideration the criteria that we normally use, summarized in the form of a benefit to the applicant as against any detriment to the community, we'll vote at this time. So I'll turn to my right.

MEMBER SCHRECK: I'm going to vote for.

1	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gottlieb.
2	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I vote for.
3	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mrs. Williams.
4	MEMBER WILLIAMS: For.
5	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Henner.
6	MEMBER HENNER: For.
7	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And I will vote for as
8	well. And we'll give two years.
9	MR. RYDER: Two years.
10	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: If you have to extend,
11	please make sure you remember.
12	MEMBER HENNER: Try to remember. Diary the
13	date.
14	MR. SAFFRA: I thank the committee for your
15	time and for your efforts.
16	MR. RYDER: Mr. Saffra, just one minute
17	Doctor, excuse me.
18	MR. SAFFRA: I assimilated tonight.
19	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: He's off-duty now.
20	MR. RYDER: Board of Building Design. This
21	application will have to go in front of the Board
22	of Building Design for further approval.
23	MR. SAFFRA: Understood.
24	(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at
25	8:00 p.m.)

1	INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE		
2	BOARD OF APPEALS		
3			
4			Village Hall 196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York
5			March 19, 2014
6			8:00 p.m.
7	APPLICATION:	Heller	
8	APPLICATION:	10 Dogwood Lane	1
9		Lawrence, New Yo	rĸ
10	PRESENT:		
11		MR. LLOYD KEILSO Chairman	N
12		MR. EDWARD GOTTL	TFB
13		Member	110
14		MR. MARK SCHRECK Member	
15		MR. LESTER HENNE	R
16		Member	
17		MS. ESTHER WILLI Member	AMS
18		MR. KENNETH GRAY	FSO
19		Village Attorney	
20		MR. MICHAEL RYDE Building Departm	
21		Darraing Dopardin	
22			
23			
24		1.4	ny Donai DDD
25			ry Benci, RPR urt Reporter

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The matter of Heller.

MR. BIENENFELD: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, distinguished building official and counsel. My name is Richard Bienenfeld. I'm the architect for the Hellers who are the owners of 10 Dogwood here in the Village. And my office is at 271 North Avenue in New Rochelle, New York.

And we made an application to this Board for relief from basically two restrictions in the Village's zoning code, one of which is building coverage and the other is rear setback. We were here before this Board about seven years ago, when we requested relief from similar restrictions when the house that was subsequently built was on a much smaller lot, a lot of approximately half the size that it currently has become since the last time we were here.

Just to be more specific, a home was bought

-- was purchased by the Hellers on Meadow Lane

adjacent to their property, and a home was bought

a little while later on Larch Hill Road adjacent

to their property. Those two properties together

add up to about 26,000 square feet. The

improvements that were on those properties at the

time were homes, and they were removed and replaced with, you know, very beautiful, very lush landscaping, designed by a very prominent landscape architect, a fellow named Hank White.

And on one of the lots a swimming pool was included; the other lot is basically green open space with very, very lush landscaping and many, many trees.

Just to put this in perspective a little bit, the land itself drinks up about 3,000 cubic feet of water per week just to maintain the plant material that's on it. In terms of, you know, helping out the Village with its storm water problems, maintaining such a vast amount of open space in this neighborhood, like I said, absorbs a tremendous amount of water. Added to that, over a thousand trees and shrubs have been planted which also need thousands of cubic feet of water every week.

When the Hellers originally planned the home, when they originally planned the home, they had a room set aside for Mrs. Heller's mother.

Mrs. Heller is here tonight and you're free to ask her any questions. But a room was set aside with a bath. At that time she was a woman in her

eighties and they wanted to keep her close and help her out and help her to be one of the family, a place where she could be visited by her grandchildren, her great grandchildren.

Subsequent to that, this area that was designated for her, which I'm circling with my finger on this plan, unfortunately, Mrs. Heller's mom has developed certain disabilities of her age and she's now in her nineties and she needs full-time 24/7 care, and she needs accessibility to a bathroom and accessibility, you know, generally to be able to get in and out of the house which is -- let me show the plan of the first floor.

So you know, right off the driveway there's an entrance to the house, and immediately adjacent to that entrance right off the driveway without negotiating any steps is the suite that

Mrs. Heller's mom now has. However, because of her current condition, and she does suffer from Alzheimer's, she does need a lot of added attention and that requires a place for a caretaker to be able to sleep in her presence.

Very often there is a second caretaker who is making up the next shift who needs to be present as well. They overlap shifts. And there is a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

place where Mrs. Heller can -- or Mrs. Heller's mom could be able to entertain guests and see her kids, see her grandchildren without entering the rest of the house.

Now, if you have questions about that, Mrs. Heller is here to answer, you know, why it's so important that she not wander through the rest of the house. Any of us who have been associated or who have been acquainted with people that age who are suffering from that type of a malady know the importance of having some definable space and that's why it's all here. It's not a lot of space that's being added. It's about 900 square feet that's being proposed. That 900 square feet in proportion, that's in proportion to the 26,000 square feet of lot area that has been added to the property since the last variance. It's 900 square feet of new construction verses the 5,000 square feet of existing construction of the two homes that were removed from those two lots. square feet of structure was removed, and 900 square feet of structure is being proposed in this particular location, which is really the only place it can go.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Is that a new office for

her as well?

vicinity, in this location.

MR. BIENENFELD: The new office is actually proposed for the house manager who, right now, yes, he has certain responsibilities for her, but he has responsibilities for the household as a whole and right now he doesn't have an office. So that was also proposed, you know, in this

You know, the addition is kind of like being woven into the -- you know, to kind of like the existing setback lines that the house is occupying now. It's actually about two feet further in than the old variance allowed and that's so that we can make use of existing foundation lines that are in the backyard for a staircase and for a terrace.

And that's important because if we're able to use that foundation line we only need 36 linear feet of new foundation to do this whole addition.

So that really minimizes the amount of disruption to the landscape.

But this is something which is extremely important to the Hellers, and I think it's, you know, a beautiful commendable project for them to want to take care of their mom, not to leave it up to others, but to take care of her in their own

home in a place where she's comfortable and a place where she can find some orientation and love from all the people who are around her, and that's why they want to do it, that's why they want to do it.

And again, I'm emphasizing how minimal this is in terms of, you know, the overall scope of the landscape that we're talking about. By the way, besides the fact that the landscape itself absorbs huge amounts of water every day and the thousands of shrubs that have been added to this property absorb huge amounts of water every day, we have provided a plan to provide within the crawlspace of this new addition a water storage tank which will take an additional 1,700 gallons of water.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I'm sorry. This 1,700, this is roof runoff that's going in there?

MR. BIENENFELD: It's roof runoff prepared for a three-inch sudden storm, a three-inch sudden storm of three inches which is the guideline for the Village. Three inches could be accommodated 100 percent in a storage tank that will eventually through a very, very small outlet leach into the existing storm water system, which is the most sophisticated system probably in the entire

Village. It has sixteen interconnected underground tanks that hold the water and slowly, slowly let it out. But like I said, the addition of all the open space that's been added to the land really does the job too, in addition to all the plant life and all the vegetation that's been lushly added to the site.

MEMBER HENNER: Can I ask you?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Jump in.

MEMBER HENNER: Good to see you again.

MR. BIENENFELD: Thank you. It's been seven years.

MEMBER HENNER: My question is not related to the water or the lushness or any of that stuff or the square footage. The project itself, I can't -- I think you said is it an extra 900 feet, whatever it is?

MR. BIENENFELD: Yes.

MEMBER HENNER: How long of a project is that to put together? Is it something that takes a month, five months, a year?

MR. BIENENFELD: So the actual exterior work is planned to be postponed till after the Jewish holidays in October, okay. So that it doesn't disturb anyone while they're enjoying their

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

outdoor season. So that was something which the Hellers actually spoke to their neighbors, and they agreed that would be the best time to do it. And most probably within 60 to 90 days all the exterior work will be done, except possibly the brick may have to be postponed till after the winter of '14/'15.

MEMBER HENNER: Here's the thing. It's not a trick question. I'm a neighbor from a couple of blocks away. I'm not even within the 300 feet. But my recollection from the last construction job is that all of the construction what was done through Meadow Lane and there were times when that road was closed. There were times I was trying to leave -- and I'm not personalizing it, it wasn't It happened to everybody. There were times the road was closed. There were times you couldn't move. There were times the traffic was just stopped arbitrarily. There were no Village officials, just workers would shut down the road, and it was causing problems. I don't know if you know about that or not.

And you know, assuming everything else is okay, how do you address it? Unless there's another way of going in there. I don't know if

this is going through Dogwood or again intended to go through Meadow Lane. Meadow Lane is this wide (indicating). And if this thing is going to be shut down to do this extension, it's going to be an issue. That's the question.

MR. BIENENFELD: The answer to the question is this is a much, much smaller project. And a lot of the reasons why, you know, there was so much disruption on Meadow Lane for the first project was, first of all, it was an enormous project, it was about twenty times the size of this project.

Also, the amount of landscaping that was brought in, you know, there were mature trees that were delivered through Meadow Lane. None of that is going to happen with this project. This is a 900 square-foot addition. It's one story. It's very, very simple to build, very, very simple to frame. Like I said, only 36 linear feet of new foundation is going in. It could be done in a couple of weeks, and the framing also a matter of weeks, and then that's all the heavy construction. Everything else is normal interior work for 900 square feet. So you know, I --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Why would we want to

1 2

subject the residents again, irrespective of the size of the project, to any further disruption? It wasn't that the disruption was done in a nice way. There were times, and I called the Building Department and said they're setting up signs closing the road again, who authorized it? And they did it unilaterally. There were times when it was highly dangerous. They stuck pylons out in the street on that curvature.

MR. BIENENFELD: Mr. Chairman, I can't answer, you know, about the sequence of construction because that's not the architect's --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: No, it goes to the detriment of the community, though yet again the subject is something that went on for five years.

MR. BIENENFELD: What I have to say is this is something which the family needs. The restrictions that are in the zoning, you know, I'm addressing restrictions in the zoning. I can say and I think anybody can say that this scope of a 900 square-foot, one-story addition is a much smaller scope, and it will be done at a time of year when people are not using their properties outdoors. And the Hellers have agreed to do that, and I think it's very reasonable that the heavy

construction could be done in 60 to 90 days. It does not have to involve any disruption of Meadow Lane, and I think that's something which the contractor will have to work out with the Building Department and with the traffic department that they do not do that.

MEMBER SCHRECK: Mr. Bienenfeld, can you explain why is there a need for a variance when the Hellers own the residence that's adjacent to their house and perhaps that could be used for the mother.

MR. BIENENFELD: Actually, there is a family living in that house now. It's one of the Hellers' children who lives in the house, and they are a large family, and space was made within the house so that the Hellers could take care of their mother in their home, as I think a lot of us would like to do if we had the ability to do it. And it's something which they thought of and which they provided for, but they didn't think about the added difficulties of this period of her life. That they weren't prepared for.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Mr. Bienenfeld, it's not uncommon that we get requests from homeowners that have to take care of a parent. We see at least

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

four or five applications a year. So we're quite sympathetic to the need.

This not only could be the largest house that had that application, but the largest request to add 900 feet. When I looked at the land where you're proposing to do this, you've got so much open space going toward Larch Hill Road, and this is such a congested area, and I think that's why we're concerned about where the construction is going to be coming from.

I haven't voiced an opinion about the closing of Meadow Lane; fortunately, I don't have to take Meadow Lane often, but I had heard quite a number of comments about it. This is just a couple of comments I'm making all at the same time.

So the question is, in a house of this size, and I know you're trying to accommodate their need, is there not a space or can a space in the house not be reconfigured?

MR. BIENENFELD: I could address that and I'll just show you the plan, okay. You know, it's a center-hall house. It has a large dining room, it has a family room, a kitchen, a library and a living room. Very, very typical rooms for a ground floor in a house. They are large rooms but

they're typical. They're, of course, highly developed and they're beautifully finished. It would be a shame to demolish those rooms for this purpose. And truthfully, they need a large dining room and they need a large kitchen and they need a large family room, you know, not unlike other or many families in the Village who entertain their children and grandchildren during holidays when no one can go home and they have to stay in the house. They need that. And by the way, these room sizes, other than perhaps the dining room, are very, very typical of other homes in the Village.

But the spot that was designated originally was put here for a reason. It's close to the driveway, and someone who is disabled can get out of a car into a wheelchair, into the house without negotiating any steps and right into this suite. That's the reason why it's here.

Also, Meadow Lane is -- you know, is totally screened. You know, this is a winter shot taken a few weeks ago. You know, it's totally screened in the winter. In the spring and summer it's a wall of green, and it doesn't disturb anyone. No one's aware of it, and it's actually the best place to

put it. And other than, you know, some disruption which is just caused by construction, you know, you can't say we're not going to do construction in the Village anymore because it's disruptive.

This will be a minimal, minimal, minimal disruption.

MEMBER HENNER: One second. You know, it's you know, minor knee surgery when it's somebody When it's my knee it's not minor. else's knee. And when you say minor, and again, this is nothing personal to my being able to go home, but when all of a sudden this is a public street in the Village, and it's a narrow street, and once you're there you can't move, okay. And all of a sudden, all of a sudden somebody's workers deign to shut down the street on you, they don't have that And it's not minor; it's annoying when right. you've got to get someplace, when you need the facilities yourself and you're trapped in your It's not a pleasant thing to see you guys telling you that you can't go anywhere. It's got to be -- the last time, nobody knew. I wasn't on the Board. But now people know, and it happened before, and it's not a question of people being able to use their backyards. It's a matter of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

2.0

2.1

Rockaway Boulevard is a major thoroughfare.

Meadow Lane is Rockaway Boulevard. It can't be the Board would approve a variance knowing up front that there's going to be construction delays caused to the Village residents on a major thoroughfare of this Village. And it's got to be —— I recognize you're the architect, not a traffic consultant, but I'm not the only one. It's a major issue here.

MR. BIENENFELD: May I put it in this light,
Mr. Henner?

MEMBER HENNER: Please, it's Lester.

MR. BIENENFELD: And to all the other Board members here.

This lot is still an independent lot and it's still an as-of-right building lot in the Village.

And it faces Meadow Lane and it fronts on

Meadow Lane. It has an address on Meadow Lane,

it's 92 Meadow Lane, and it's been maintained that

way, and a house can be built here as of right

without even visiting this Board. A 5,000

square-foot house could be built right here, a

5,000 square-foot house could be right here on

Meadow Lane as of right. And we wouldn't even

have to come to the Board. Yes, it's not as

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

convenient as having it over here. But this is a much more minimal request. And we would much rather build it here than build it here. Plus we could build another 5,000 square-foot house on Larch Hill Road. That is an independent lot on Larch Hill Road. It does not need any -- any approval by this Board. It is an as-of-right building lot on Larch Hill Road. It had a house on it, it was removed; a new house could be put back as of right. These lots were added after the previous variance was granted. What we are saying is we have all this open

What we are saying is we have all this open space. We're asking this Board to consider this fact that with all this beautifully landscaped open space we're looking to put a small addition in the crevice of the plan that faces Meadow Lane. And like you said, it's a thoroughfare, it doesn't bother anybody. It has a brick wall in front of it. It has a dark green wall of vegetation behind that. It's totally screened from anybody.

There may be 60 to 90 days' construction going on. I doubt if there will be much disruption. I'm not the contractor; I can't guarantee that, but I'm sure he would. There are gates, by the way where materials and even

vehicles could come in and not disrupt the traffic on Meadow Lane, but that's the truth.

The truth is they could build on Meadow Lane. They don't have to come to this Board, and they could build a 5,000 square-foot house on Meadow Lane, not a 900 square-foot addition.

MR. RYDER: Mr. Bienenfeld, if I may, just for the record, I understand when you say you could build as of right, but currently that lot, the three are merged as one, so when you're saying as of right, you would have to go through subdivisions to subdivide the two that have already been merged to one, and then you would exacerbate your variances on the existing lot.

So for the record, when you're saying as of right, you had it prior to, but as of right now, today, I don't think that's accurate.

MR. BIENENFELD: Well, when I say as of right, I mean according to the Village zoning.

According to the Village zoning, these lots are as-of-right lots and they can be subdivided as of right. Of course, they have to go through a process, I acknowledge that, of course.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You're trying to balance that against --

MR. BIENENFELD: But a visit to this Board would not be necessary.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: No, but the variances would be different on the original property.

MR. BIENENFELD: No, they would not, because the original property the variances were granted on 28,000 square feet.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: I'm talking about in terms of a request you're making now.

MR. BIENENFELD: In other words, had we come here and had those lots been merged, yes, that would be true. But those lots did not exist the last time we were at this Board.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: All I'm saying is if you sold the two of them off tomorrow and then your request would be different because you wouldn't have all that property in terms of the coverage.

MR. BIENENFELD: That's true.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: That's all I'm saying.

MR. BIENENFELD: But they are here and they are merged as one, so that is the request that we're making tonight.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: You want it both ways.

MR. BIENENFELD: But saying, you know, that any construction on Meadow Lane cannot be done in

the Village of Lawrence is just not true.

2

MEMBER HENNER: Time out.

MEMBER HENNER:

3

CHAIRMAN KEILSON:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Whoa, whoa, whoa.

If you want me to ask her to

read the record back, I will. I didn't say that. What I did say is that there was a major disruption to residents by that construction several years ago. Major, okay. And the guestion was, which I think is a legitimate question, not because I raised it, but just because it's legitimate, and that is what will be done to minimize disruption? We didn't say no construction could be done on Meadow Lane, but there is a legitimate concern to say what's going to be -- first of all, it is a very dangerous It's a rounded curve, and if you don't know the guys are stopped there, you've run around the curve and all of a sudden there's some worker there with a stop sign. You know, it's not a police department stop sign. He makes up a stop sign, he became the policeman there. I think it's a legitimate concern that needs to be addressed and shouldn't just -- I recognize as of right and all that stuff, that's great. But even as of right, you still have to address the concerns of

the Village as far as traffic is concerned, don't you think? It might not be your area, but you know.

MR. BIENENFELD: Of course they have to be addressed in the normal way that they're always addressed when there's construction in the Village. I don't think that's an issue in terms of granting a variance for building lot coverage and granting a variance to rear-yard setback. I don't think they're cogent to that type of application that's before you. That might be a different concern of the Building Department during construction to keep the right of way clear, and I applaud that, and I think -- I think that's important that those who do build respect that, and I assume they will.

MEMBER HENNER: I hear you, but I think in terms of the balancing of the equities and the detriment to the Village and the benefit to the homeowner, and stuff like that which you're well aware of, that the traffic concerns fall under the rubric of detriment to the community or detriment to the neighbors and stuff like that. So I don't think that -- I think it is cogent to the -- it might not have anything to do with square footage

per se, I agree with that, it's got zip to do with square footage, but I think it's a legitimate balancing question, and that's all and I'd just like to hear that there's a recognition that it's a concern and that it will be dealt with, as opposed to saying it's only going to be 60 to 90 days, don't worry about it.

MR. BIENENFELD: First of all, it certainly is a concern and certainly will be dealt with. I just want to say this for the record as well, that the issue of the relief from building area and rear-yard setback it's those issues that are the legitimate concerns of the variance -- of the Board of Zoning Appeals. Their concern is whether or not the relief that we are seeking for building area and for rear lot line are being addressed properly in terms of the spirit of what those zoning restrictions are supposed to do.

Now, you know, the zoning restrictions themselves and, you know, please feel free to comment on why I'm saying this, but the purpose of these restrictions is to control the bulk and the size of the buildings that are built within a certain zone. And the addition of a 900 square-foot improvement to this house in light of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the 26,000 square feet of lot area that's been added is clear that it's within the spirit of the bulk restrictions, especially it's a one-story addition, within the bulk restrictions of the Village's zoning code. The Village's zoning code is there to control bulk. The Village zoning code is not really there to address matters of traffic and disruption because it's not within the purview of this Board.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I have to dissent. five criteria, the statutory criteria do have an element beyond your philosophical discussion of If you go through the statutory criteria, it's quite clear that things such as the impact on the Village in terms of traffic and the like definitely are relevant. It talks about things as can the benefit sought by the applicant be achieved by some method other than a variance? Will the proposed variance have an adverse effect on the physical environmental conditions of the neighborhood? Is the alleged difficulty for the applicant self-created? You know, there's more than just looking at the square footage, and I understand your philosophical bent, but we have to be concerned about broader needs of the Village

which do fall within the criteria of our consideration in terms of, you know, giving a variance.

And the problem here is there's a very bad track record. There's a track record of not caring, okay. Whether it be with this contractor. I'm not saying it's the Hellers, but this went on for five years.

MR. BIENENFELD: Yeah, I must say to this
Board, and this I know for to be true, the Hellers
whenever they had any complaints or issues brought
up by a neighbor they attended to it. They
attended to it wholeheartedly and satisfied every
neighbor's concern.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Again, I'm not speaking of the Hellers. I want to make that a hundred percent clear.

MR. BIENENFELD: By the way, I don't see any neighbors here this evening.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I'm a neighbor. I live in the Village. I was disrupted time and time again. Ask Mr. Ryder how many calls he got.

MR. BIENENFELD: Mr. Chairman, if I may.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Yes.

MR. BIENENFELD: We're talking about bulk and

1 we're talking about dimension. And I think it's 2 unfair for this Board to establish a precedent 3 that they're also going to start talking about 4 traffic disruption. Especially, there's --5 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: It's not a precedent. 6 MEMBER HENNER: It's not a precedent. 7 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Not at all. 8 MR. BIENENFELD: Let me say this. There's no 9 driveway facing Meadow Lane. You're talking about 10 only during a limited period of construction. 11 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Can you do the 12 construction from some other vantage point? 13 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: From Dogwood? 14 MR. BIENENFELD: I assume it can. I assume 15 it can. 16 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Since --17 MR. BIENENFELD: I assume they can 18 I don't know if that would wheelbarrow stuff in. 19 be less disruptive. 20 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Certainly not disruptive 21 to Meadow Lane. 22 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: The adjacent home is owned 23 by the homeowner.

25 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So they're inconveniencing

Yes.

MR. BIENENFELD:

themselves. 1 2 MR. BIENENFELD: Yes. 3 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: It's just an option. 4 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Would there be any issue 5 if we make it contingent on construction being 6 done out of Dogwood? 7 MR. BIENENFELD: That's up to the Board. 8 That's up to the Board. 9 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: What's the square footage 10 of the house as it stands today? 11 MR. BIENENFELD: The footprint of the house 12 totally, it's on my chart, it stands today as 13 7,304 square feet. 14 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: That's the footprint. 15 the house in total? 16 MR. BIENENFELD: Well, it's a little less 17 than double that. There are, you know, some 18 two-story spaces in the house. 19 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: The basements are not 20 counted? 21 MR. BIENENFELD: There's a finished basement 22 as well. 23 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Does that get counted in 24 square footage? This is not a trick question.

just would like to know, do we count basements in

the basement which is habitable, but the rest of

the basement is storage rooms, mechanical rooms,

1

total square footage?

3

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

so there is a large playroom probably about six or 700 square feet. MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So when one considers the size of the house, you're only including habitable

MR. BIENENFELD: Well, there is a playroom in

MR. BIENENFELD: Well, again, you have to say what you want to count. If you want to count all the storage space, all the mechanical, the boiler room --

space, not including finished basements?

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So the size is up to the interpreter of how they want to present it?

MR. BIENENFELD: Well, you know, there are always guidelines in how you measure square footage, you know. I'm sure there's a guideline in our own code, and there's a guideline -- the Real Estate Board has a guideline. There's all different ways of talking about square footage, but generally we talk about -- in our field we're talking about habitable space.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Finished space.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I'd like to go into

executive session with counsel just to talk about some aspects of it, so we'll break for a few minutes.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken; the application continued.)

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Back on the record with the Heller matter. Mr. Bienenfeld.

MR. BIENENFELD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think we all understand the compelling arguments you make as to the square-footage issue and why it's almost de minimis considering the acquisition of property since the last series of variances were granted. And so we're not unsympathetic to that aspect.

We also understand the special circumstances involved in trying to accommodate an elderly parent, again we're not unsympathetic, and we've heard such matters before, and we've always been extremely forthcoming and willing to accommodate. So we're not going to vary from our history in terms of trying to accommodate the residents in these types of situations. At the same time we do have to take cognition of the fact that there is an issue in terms of accessibility to the site and the history in terms of things going on on that

site from the Meadow Lane area.

2.2

Again, with that in mind, Mr. Henner.

So what I'm going to propose is that we condition the variances on the access to the construction being done either from the Dogwood side or from the Larch Hill Road side, whatever is easier for you or the contractors, but it can't be

MR. BIENENFELD: Okay.

done from the Meadow Lane side.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That's the proposal I'm making before the Board. And I think within the criteria I think we can balance all of the equities, and I think we can arrive at an appropriate decision.

MR. BIENENFELD: Thank you. I think that's very fair, and I would certainly recommend to my clients to accept that with that restriction.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. So I'm going to put it before the Board now to vote, again, to approve the variances as presented in terms of square footage, in terms of the backyard, the side yard, whatever the issue is, and conditioned on the fact that the construction only will be from either the other local streets, that's Dogwood or Larch Hill, as opposed to from Meadow Lane.

1 MEMBER HENNER: I'm in favor. 2 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mrs. Williams. 3 MEMBER WILLIAMS: For. 4 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gottlieb. 5 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: In favor. 6 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Schreck. 7 MEMBER SCHRECK: For. 8 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And I'm for as well. 9 And we urge you to try to do it as 10 expeditiously as possible. I understand you've 11 outlined it and it's subject to climate conditions 12 and the like, but in light of the fact there's 13 been so much construction for so many years I 14 think it would behoove you to further expedite the 15 project as possible. 16 MR. BIENENFELD: The Board's points are well 17 taken. Thank you very, very much. Thank you, 18 good night. 19 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Thank you. 20 MR. RYDER: Did we give a time frame? 21 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: What time frame should we 2.2 give you, how many days? 23 MR. GRAY: One year is --24 MR. BIENENFELD: We plan to start

construction, like I said, in the fall after the

Jewish holidays and complete construction by 1 2 spring of 2015. 3 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So eighteen months. 4 MR. BIENENFELD: Thank you. 5 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Eighteen months. 6 MR. RYDER: And Board of Building Design. 7 MR. BIENENFELD: Board of Building Design. 8 Thank you very much. 9 MR. RYDER: Eighteen months. 10 (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 8:55 p.m.) ********** 12 13 Certified that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the original stenographic 15 minutes in this case. 16 MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter 19

11

14

17

18

20

21

22

23

24